

State Incentive Grant Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol  
(Cohorts IV – VII)

May 12, 2004



## State Incentive Grant Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol

The *SIG Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol* provides a standardized framework for SIG state evaluators to use to collect and report on process and outcome data and report on their progress. Such data are already being collected by the SIG state evaluators, based on earlier discussions over a common framework and terminology. However, to date, no common reporting protocol has been defined.

Use of the *SIG Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol* offers state evaluators the flexibility and structure to record their SIG developments in a comprehensive and common format. The protocol is based on an evaluation framework of constructs, indicators, and data sources developed by the first cohort of SIG states and CSAP. For any given state, the protocol also can be customized (the cross-site team will review these modifications). Finally, CSAP has defined the *SIG Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol* as the framework to be used by the SIG states to report their progress in a standard format which partially fulfills their semi-annual reporting requirements.

This common format is designed to facilitate the development of the SIG state final report which follows a similar format. A draft of the *SIG Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol* is due 30 days following the end of each semi-annual reporting period. Because of the complexity of the SIG Program, a list of special terms and their definitions is found in Attachment A, to be used in compiling state semi-annual reports.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 hours per State Incentive Grant recipient per year, to compile data, already assumed to have been collected by the evaluators as part of their ongoing work, into a common format. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer; Paperwork Reduction Project (XXXX-XXXX); Room 16-105, Parklawn Building; 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this project is XXXX-XXXX.



## **I. SOURCES OF DATA**

In order to establish a credible analysis, a diverse array of evidence must be collected and integrated. Converging evidence should be sought, to substantiate actual SIG events and occurrences. To this end, information related to the topics of inquiry will be gathered and documented from multiple sources, including: interviewees, archival records, documents, and direct observations.

### **Interviewees**

To track the planning and implementation process, interviewees may include:

- The SIG project director;
- Other key staff members (e.g., project manager, project coordinator);
- Advisory council members;
- Sub-recipient representatives; and
- Program administrators.

### **Archival Records and Documentary Evidence**

The description of the state's planning and implementation of their project is to be a factual description. Therefore, the documentation of events must be precise and meticulously recorded. Dates, places, names, titles of persons, and specific events must be accurate and substantiated with explicit evidence, not just an interviewee's recall. Potential sources of data are:

- The state's RFC or RFP;
- Sub-recipient applications;
- Fiscal budget(s);
- Organizational charts;
- Minutes of meetings or meeting agendas;
- Memoranda of Understanding or other interagency agreements (formal or informal);
- Legislative documents;
- Technical assistance or other educational materials; and
- Survey data about youth ATOD use.



## **Direct Observations**

Direct observations would come from site visits to sub-recipient interventions, attendance at technical assistance workshops to sub-recipients, and attendance at other key working sessions.

## **II. TOPICS OF INQUIRY**

The *SIG Semi-Annual Progress Report Protocol* is divided into 4 major sections (see Attachment B). The majority of the topics of inquiry addressed by the protocol can be directly linked to the SIG logic model (see Attachment C). Note that if the only evidence for a particular question comes from an interviewee, the strength of evidence is perceptual and should be reported as such (e.g., “interviewees reported that...”). Only when the interview evidence is combined with some corroborating documentary data would the level of evidence be considered stronger. Therefore, the investigator should be continually seeking corroborating evidence. Collected data may be qualitative or quantitative and may be presented in narrative, numeric table, word table, or diagram formats.



**ATTACHMENT A:**

**Definitions of Common Concepts in the SIG Evaluation**



### Definitions of Common Concepts in the SIG Evaluation

Action	A type of intervention more geared to events than service delivery, such as a media campaign or community-based advocacy (e.g., work stoppages, picketing, or pressing for local ordinances)
ATOD Use	Alcohol, tobacco or other drugs use
Community	The population or area targeted by a program or action (e.g., a geographic area, cultural or economic identification, or political jurisdiction)
Comprehensive Prevention	A deliberately assembled and coordinated collection of interventions that cover three or more domains (individual/peer; school; family; community; workplace; faith community; and health care system)
Core Measures Requirements	Measures to be used when concepts are relevant to a prevention program; to cover programs from each of three domains, with each program having a sufficient sample size (N=30) to perform statistical analysis
Final Report Protocol	Procedures for collecting data; topics of inquiry for the field investigator, not necessarily questions to an interviewee; topics commonly seek “how” and “why” explanations, as well as enumerations of outcomes, not simply “yes-no” answers
Outcomes	Immediate (e.g., clients served or environmental policies changed); intermediate (e.g., risk and protective factors changes in a population or in a community or environment, including reduction in harm); long-term (e.g., changes in ATOD use behavior or related behavior such as delays in onset of first use of ATODs)
Prevention Intervention	A coherent prevention initiative (has objectives; domains; targeted; selective or universal population; an action, program or practice; presumed outcomes; and actual outcomes)
Science-based/Evidence-based Intervention	A prevention activity that has been evaluated and proven to prevent or reduce ATOD abuse and other related high-risk behaviors such as those found in the National Registry of Effective Programs
Youth	Persons ages 12-17



**ATTACHMENT B:**  
**State Incentive Grant Final Report Protocol**



**STATE INCENTIVE GRANT SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT  
FORMAT AND CONTENT PROTOCOL – COHORTS IV - VII**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Goals, Objectives, Accomplishments, Milestones (GOAMs)</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports*</b>
A.	List goals and objectives from original proposal and note accomplishments and milestones completed .....	1-6
B.	Describe how goals and objectives have remained the same or changed.....	2-6
C.	Include chronological summary of significant events (itemized listing of most significant events during the semi-annual report period .....	2-6
D.	Describe evaluation accomplishments (e.g. instruments used, outcomes assessment, use of core measures, future schedule and milestones) .....	2-6
E.	Describe relationship with project officer and project officer's involvement in SIG activities .....	1-6
<b>II.</b>	<b>Project Narrative</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports</b>
A.	SIG Mobilization	
1.	Creation of the SIG organization and staff .....	1-2
a.	What was the original organizational configuration of the SIG effort? (Please provide an early organizational chart).	
b.	What staff were already available for effort?	
c.	What new staff hired as a result of the grant, loaned by agencies, or brought on as volunteers?	
d.	Since the initial creation, how has the SIG organization changed? (A current organizational chart would be useful).	
2.	Needs assessment activities and results .....	1-2
a.	Prior to or at the beginning of the SIG award, was any inventory or needs assessment conducted to guide the design and intervention of the SIG award? (A copy of the needs assessment and results would be useful).	
b.	If conducted, what did the needs assessment conclude?	
c.	If a needs assessment was not conducted, were other data (e.g., youth surveys) consulted? What conclusions were drawn?	
3.	Evaluation planning .....	1-2
•	What progress has been made in developing an evaluation strategy for SIG?	

---

\* Each SIG state is required to submit six semi-annual progress reports. The numbers listed under the heading of "Semi-Annual Reports" indicate which semi-annual reports should include the information indicated on the corresponding line. For the most part, Reports 1 and 2 focus on planning, Reports 3-5 focus on process, and Report 6 focuses on outcomes.



<b>II. Project Narrative (Continued)</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports</b>
4. Other startup activities .....	<b>1-2</b>
<b>B. State Prevention System Characteristics</b>	
1. Delivery system .....	<b>1-2</b>
• Describe the current statewide prevention service delivery system?	
• Who is responsible at the state level for ATOD prevention programming? (e.g., lead agencies, other agencies involved)	
2. Role of specific agencies	
• At the time of the SIG award, describe the role of the state agencies responsible for the ATOD prevention services in the state (e.g., substance abuse, education, social services). ....	<b>1</b>
• As part of the statewide prevention service delivery system, has the role of the specific state agencies and organizations changed from the time of the SIG award to the present time? (e.g., changes in state agencies that were leaders in youth substance abuse prevention; changes in the youth substance abuse prevention programs administered by each agency or organization; or changes in each agency or organization's budget for youth substance prevention). Please note the month and year of all changes. ....	<b>2-6</b>
3. Collaboration among state agencies, or between state and local agencies	
• Describe collaboration, if any, among state agencies or state and local organizations prior to the SIG award. ....	<b>1</b>
• Has the collaboration among state agencies or state and local organizations changed from the time of the SIG award to the present time? (e.g., shared information or data; joint planning, program design, or funding; joint delivery service, or changes in community based planning and initiatives). Please note the month and year of all changes. ....	<b>2-6</b>
<b>C. Coordination, Leveraging and Redirecting of Funding Streams</b>	
1. Conditions Prior to SIG Award.....	<b>1</b>
• Describe, if applicable, how the state coordinated, redirected, or leveraged prevention funds prior to the SIG award? (A table showing the specific sources and annual amounts of these funds would be useful).	



II. Project Narrative ( <i>Continued</i> )	Semi-Annual Reports 3,4,5
2. Development of SIG-Supported Process ..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the current process, created under the SIG award, to develop a systematic approach for coordinating, redirecting, or leveraging federal and state substance abuse prevention resources that target communities, families, schools, and workplaces.</li> <li>Was an inventory of funds initially made? (A table would be useful. If possible, the table should contain the amounts from each funding source, the restrictions on the funds, and other conditions associated with their expenditure. The table should also provide annual amounts over SIG-related funding years.</li> </ul>	
3. Differences before and after SIG award ..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are prevention funds now coordinated, redirected, or leveraged? (e.g., consolidated RPP among state agencies)</li> <li>How does this differ from what was done prior to the SIG award?</li> </ul>	3,4,5
D. Revitalized Comprehensive Strategic Planning	
1. Conditions Prior to SIG Award..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the state have a comprehensive strategic plan (for drug prevention) prior to the SIG award (a copy of the plan would be useful).</li> <li>If the state did have a comprehensive strategic plan, was this plan the result of a formal process, and was the process in place just prior to the SIG award?</li> </ul>	3,4,5
2. SIG-supported process ..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the process, created under the SIG award, by which the state coordinated, developed, and implemented a revitalized, comprehensive statewide prevention strategy.</li> <li>Joint programming across state agencies</li> <li>New decision-making structures</li> <li>Include in the description details about the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan's goals and objectives</li> <li>The groups of youths, families, schools, and communities targeted</li> <li>The risk and protective factors targeted, if any</li> <li>The logic of geographic coverage (e.g., statewide, regional)</li> <li>The role of science-based prevention approaches, if any, and</li> <li>Inclusion of community-based strategies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3,4,5
3. Differences before and after SIG award ..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is a comprehensive, statewide prevention strategy now administered or pursued (a copy of the plan, if any, would be useful).</li> <li>How does this plan differ from what was done prior to the SIG award.</li> </ul>	3,4,5



II. Project Narrative ( <i>Continued</i> )	Semi-Annual Reports
E. State Outcomes	
1. Target populations reached or environmental conditions affected..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the time SIG was awarded to the present time, were there any state level changes in the targeted, indicated, or universal populations, or the environment?</li> </ul>	6
2. Effect on risk and protective factors..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the time SIG was awarded to the present time, were there any changes in the state-level risk and protective factors?</li> </ul>	6
3. Possible Rival Explanations for State Outcomes..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summarize the potential role of the other statewide prevention programs, besides the SIGs, that were in place during the SIG effort that might account for any of the significant state-level immediate outcomes, systems changes, or state-level intermediate and long-term outcomes (e.g., the U.S. Department of Safe and Drug-Free Schools program; ONDCP's national youth anti-drug media campaign; OJJDP's Blueprints Project; and other non-CSAP related state-funded prevention programs".</li> <li>What are the most compelling arguments of any of these initiatives, and not the SIG award, accounted for the changes in the state's capabilities or drug abuse-related outcomes?</li> </ul>	6
F. Most Valuable Lessons Learned about Youth Substance Abuse Prevention ..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the most valuable lessons learned about the effect of state-level systems change on the delivery of youth substance abuse programs as a result of the SIG grant.</li> </ul>	6
III. Advisory Council Development and Membership	Semi-Annual Reports
A. Describe the establishment of your Advisory Council. (Please provide a list of initial membership.).....	1
B. Have there been changes in the structure or composition of your Advisory Council since your original proposal was submitted? If so, please describe and give rationale for changes.....	1-6
C. Describe role and involvement of the Governor's office in Advisory Council activities .....	1-6
D. List current Advisory Council membership and provide demographic information to demonstrate diversity (geographic, gender, cultural). .....	1-6



<b>III. Advisory Council Development and Membership (<i>Continued</i>)</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports</b>
E. List government agencies represented on council.....	1-6
F. List and describe Advisory Council activities, including meeting dates, significant actions taken, problems encountered, etc. ....	1-6
G. Describe the role and involvement of the CSAP Project Officer in Advisory Council activities.....	1-6
<b>IV Sub-recipient Plan</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports</b>
A. Describe your plan and how it may have changed during this reporting period, including the timeline for dispersing money to sub-recipients and the anticipated number of sub-recipients .....	1,2,3
B. How will you incorporate CSAP’s RFC guidelines into your sub-recipient award criteria? What other criteria are being proposed for selection of sub-recipients?.....	2,3
C. What steps are being put in place to encourage/ensure use of science-based prevention models, programs, approaches, strategies by sub-recipients? .....	2,3
D. Actual Sub-recipient Re-granting Process (e.g., peer review process; applications and awards)	
1. Describe the strategies and the rationale underlying the design of the RFC(s) developed by the SIG, as well as any anticipated events in the process.....	3,4
2. Include the following in the above requested description: .....	3,4
• “Fit” with comprehensive prevention strategy;	
• Sub-recipient selection criteria and concern for equity;	
• Concern for sufficient number of applications;	
• Timing of issuance of RFC; and	
• Limitations or definitions of eligible prevention activities	
3. Application and Awards .....	3,4
• How many applications were received and for what types of programs?	
• What proportion and how many received awards? What was the size and duration of these awards? (Please provide tables displaying the characteristics of both applications and awards. The total of the awards would be related to the total SIG award, including how the 85 percent criterion was met.)	
• What was the process for reviewing applications, and how were decisions made?	



<b>IV Sub-recipient Plan (Continued)</b>	<b>Semi-Annual Reports</b>
4. Subsequent Prevention Resources or Comprehensiveness .....	<b>3,4</b>
• Did the SIG-supported prevention activity appear to affect the sub-recipient's subsequent level of prevention resources or the comprehensiveness of the array of prevention activities in the community?	
E. Sub-recipient Characteristics (e.g., length of support for sub-recipients and programs; types of sub-recipients; types of target population, domain, etc.; tiered relationship, if any, between sub-recipient- and program-levels; and number of prevention programs per sub-recipient) .....	<b>3,4</b>
F. Results of State Tracking of Sub-recipient Activities; State Provision of Technical Assistance to Sub-recipients .....	<b>4,5</b>
G. Sub-recipient Outcomes (e.g., target populations reached or environmental conditions affected; effect on risk and protective factors) .....	<b>5,6</b>
H. Possible Rival Explanations for Sub-recipient Outcomes .....	<b>6</b>



### Reporting Period Dates Cohorts IV, V and V(a)

	Reporting Periods	Due Date
<b>Cohort IV</b> (Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia)	Oct 1, 2000 – Mar 31, 2001	Apr 30, 2001
	Apr 1, 2001 – Sep 30, 2001	Oct 31, 2001
	Oct 1, 2001 – Mar 31, 2002	Apr 30, 2002
	Apr 1, 2002 – Sep 30, 2002	Oct 31, 2002
	Oct 1, 2002 – Mar 31, 2003	Apr 30, 2003
	Apr 1, 2003 – Sep 30, 2003	Oct 31, 2003
	Oct 1, 2003 – Mar 31, 2004	Apr 30, 2004
	Apr 1, 2004 – Sep 30, 2004	Oct 31, 2004
<b>Cohort V</b> (Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Wyoming)	Oct 1, 2001 – Mar 31, 2002	Apr 30, 2002
	Apr 1, 2002 – Sep 30, 2002	Oct 31, 2002
	Oct 1, 2002 – Mar 31, 2003	Apr 30, 2003
	Apr 1, 2003 – Sep 30, 2003	Oct 31, 2003
	Oct 1, 2003 – Mar 31, 2004	Apr 30, 2004
	Apr 1, 2004 – Sep 30, 2004	Oct 31, 2004
	Oct 1, 2004 – Mar 31, 2005	Apr 30, 2005
	Apr 1, 2005 – Sep 30, 2005	Oct 31, 2005
<b>Cohort V(a)</b> (Texas)	Apr 1, 2002 – Sep 30, 2002	Oct 31, 2002
	Oct 1, 2002 – Mar 31, 2003	Apr 30, 2003
	Apr 1, 2003 – Sep 30, 2003	Oct 31, 2003
	Oct 1, 2003 – Mar 31, 2004	Apr 30, 2004
	Apr 1, 2004 – Sep 30, 2004	Oct 31, 2004
	Oct 1, 2004 – Mar 31, 2005	Apr 30, 2005
	Apr 1, 2005 – Sep 30, 2005	Oct 31, 2005
	Oct 1, 2005 – Mar 31, 2006	Apr 30, 2006